

REMARKS

Initially, the Advisory Action indicates that the amendments filed March 1, 2010 present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejection claims.

However, claims 1, 4 and 6-8 were cancelled and no new claims were presented in the Amendment filed March 1, 2010.

Applicant submits that claims 9-14 and 20 are patentable over the cited references for the reasons stated in the Remarks section of the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed March 1, 2010 and for the additional reasons set forth below.

To further demonstrate the patentability of the present claims over the cited references, Applicant submits herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 executed by Mr. Takahiko Matsui. The Declaration shows bad effects when non-rubber components are completely removed as in the case of conventional deproteinization treatment as in Ichikawa et al and Kawamura et al. In both Ichikawa et al and Kawamura et al, protease was used to decompose protein in natural rubber latex.

In the Declaration, additional Comparative Production Examples 2, 3 and 4 were prepared and compared with Production Example 3 of the specification. The results were shown in Tables 1 and 2 at page 5 of the Declaration.

As shown in Table 1 of the Declaration, only cellulase was used in the Production Example 3 of the specification, only protease was used in Comparative Production Example 2, and both cellulase and protease were used in Comparative Production Examples 3 and 4 with a different amount of protease.

As shown by the data in Table 2 of the Declaration, Comparative Production Examples 2 and 3 using a protease were inferior in tensile strength (Tb) and $\tan \delta$ when they are compared with Production Example 3 in which only cellulase was used. The smaller the $\tan \delta$ is, the lower the hysteresis loss property is (page 19, lines 18-19 of the specification).

Specifically, in Production Example 3 in which only cellulase (0.15 g) was used, Tb is 27.1 and $\tan \delta$ is 0.194. In Comparative Production Example 2 in which only protease (7.5 g) was used, Tb is 23.9 and $\tan \delta$ is 0.221. In Comparative Production Example 3 in which cellulase (0.15 g) and protease (7.5 g) were used, Tb is 24.9 and $\tan \delta$ is 0.218.

In Comparative Production Example 4 in which cellulase and protease were used and centrifugation treatment was conducted, the aging resistance thereof is inferior when compared with Production Example 3 in which only cellulase was used.

In view of the above, the present claims are not obvious and are patentable over Kawamura et al, Galimberti et al and Ichikawa et al.

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/537,698

Attorney Docket No.: Q86396

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hui Chen Wauters

Hui C. Wauters
Registration No. 57,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 29, 2010